
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 9 June 2015

Site visit made on 9 June 2015

by M Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 January 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/W/15/3003166

Land at Oldfield Farm, Carr Head Lane, Poulton-le-Fylde, Lancashire, FY6 8EG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Redrow Homes Ltd (Lancashire Division) against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 14/00607/OUTMAJ, dated 23 July 2014, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2014.
 - The development proposed is the erection of up to 100 dwellings with access applied for as a detailed matter and following the demolition of 115 Carr Head Lane.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for the erection of up to 100 dwellings with access applied for as a detailed matter and following the demolition of 115 Carr Head Lane on Land at Oldfield Farm, Carr Head Lane, Poulton-le-Fylde, Lancashire, FY6 8EG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 14/00607/OUTMAJ, dated 23 July 2014, subject to the conditions set out in the Annex.

Procedural Matters

2. The application has been submitted in outline with approval for access being sought at this point. All remaining matters (layout, appearance, landscaping and scale) are reserved for later approval. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis, treating the plans submitted in all respects save for the means of access as indicative of the type of development that could be carried out.
3. I have noted that the Council has incorporated reference to the demolition of 115 Carr Head Lane within the description of development used on the Notice of Decision, and that the appellant has subsequently incorporated this into the description of development set out within the Grounds of Appeal. I am satisfied that this version of the description of development is accurate in the context of the proposals, and I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.
4. A number of additional documents, technical responses and further submissions from the main and interested parties have been submitted both at, and after the Hearing. These submissions have addressed issues related to highway matters, acoustic measures and noise generation, education infrastructure, and the potential for the withdrawal of bus subsidies. A

Unilateral Undertaking has also been submitted principally addressing education infrastructure and bus subsidies. I am satisfied that the main and interested parties have been provided with an appropriate opportunity to consider these further submissions, and my decision has therefore taken these additional documents into account.

Background and Main Issues

5. The appeal site occupies 5.38 hectares of gently sloping land to the east of the rear of residential properties on Carr Head Lane, and is approximately 1.2 kilometres away from the town centre of Poulton-le-Fylde. The land is broadly rectangular in shape and is indicated as agricultural land used for grazing and silage production, and is bounded to the south by an established hedgerow and watercourse adjacent to Oldfield Carr Lane, beyond which are residential properties and a farm. To the north of the appeal site are the land and buildings associated with Carr Head Primary School and The Happy Days Nursery.
6. The site is located adjacent to the existing urban built-up area, and as a consequence would therefore be designated as countryside in accordance with the Development Plan, which incorporates the saved policies of the Wyre Borough Local Plan 1999 (the Local Plan). The proposed residential development of the land is therefore highlighted as being contrary to saved Policy SP13 in respect of its location within the countryside, and given that it does not meet one of the five exception criteria of the policy. Nevertheless, I note that Poulton-le-Fylde is indicated within the agreed Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) to be a sustainable settlement as identified within Policy CS6 of the Wyre Borough Council Core Strategy Preferred Options 2012 (the Preferred Options), and as a Key Service Centre and focus for the delivery of additional housing. Whilst I have had regard to the limited weight which may be attached to the Preferred Options due to its current status and progress towards an adopted Core Strategy, I would not disagree with the above classification of Poulton-le-Fylde.
7. In seeking to define the main issues of this appeal, I have been mindful of the wording of the Council's reasons for refusal and the content of the SoCG. However, despite matters relating to highway safety having been highlighted as not in dispute between the main parties, on the basis of the evidence and various submissions at the Hearing, I consider this to also be a main issue. Furthermore, it is evident from the additional evidence and submissions placed before me by the Council and appellant subsequent to the Hearing, that there remains some dispute over the quantum and nature of infrastructure requirements pertaining to the mitigation of impact on education facilities.
8. I therefore consider the main issues to be:
 - whether the proposed development would safeguard the living conditions of existing occupiers of Carr Head Lane, having regard to noise and disturbance and light pollution;
 - whether the proposal would result in an adverse impact on the safety of highway users, drivers and pedestrians, and be suitably accessible by alternative means of transport; and,

- whether the proposal makes adequate provision for local infrastructure requirements.

Reasons

9. The SoCG highlights that the Council is unable currently to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, based on the objectively assessed need (OAN) set out in the Fylde Coast Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 (SHMA). The SHMA indicates that the Council's OAN lies between a range of approximately 377 – 485 dwellings a year (taking into account 2011 Census Data) for the period 2011 – 2030, with the Council confirming that whether using the lower or upper end figures that a five-year supply is not achievable. Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that local authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements. Paragraph 49 goes on to say, that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, and that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
10. Despite the highlighted conflict with saved Policy SP13, the Council does not object to the principle of the release of the site for residential development, even allowing for its 'greenfield' location on the edge of the existing settlement. I note that the land is not considered best and most versatile agricultural land as defined in Annex 2 of the Framework, being identified in the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) as land in Grade 3b. However, I recognise that the development of the land would, to some extent, run counter to the Framework's core planning principle (paragraph 17) of recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Nevertheless, this principle should not be considered in isolation given that paragraph 17 also supports sustainable economic development to deliver the homes that the country needs. Given the absence of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land or any compelling evidence that housing needs could be met on previously developed land, I consider that whilst the land is pleasant, there is nothing about the appeal site which would warrant its protection against development over and above any other area of countryside.
11. I have carefully considered the various submissions which have been made by interested parties regarding the principle of the development of the land. These include concerns over the claimed level of accessibility of the appeal site, and also whether there is an actual need for additional housing within Poulton-le-Fylde in the light of various approved and anticipated residential developments. Whilst I will return to the issue of accessibility later in this decision, in respect of the need for additional housing, I have had regard to the references made to the Preferred Options and in particular that Poulton-le-Fylde would be expected under emerging Policy CS1 to accommodate as part of the distribution of development within the area, 600 dwellings, or 17.6% of the overall residual requirement.
12. As I have already set out above, the policies within the Preferred Options document attract only very limited weight given the limited progress towards adoption, and in any event the figures do not represent a maximum target but a minimum level of supply to achieve. Furthermore, whilst I have had regard

to the calculations undertaken by the interested parties in respect of existing consented or anticipated residential development within Poulton-le-Fylde, I agree with the Council's statement in its Planning Committee Update Sheet of December 2014. This statement expressed that any update on the 5 year supply of deliverable housing land must be undertaken as a comprehensive review of supply, rather than a simplistic exercise of adding on the number of dwellings which have been recently approved. As a consequence, whilst I have had regard to the contrary evidence submitted by the interested parties on this matter, I do not consider this assessment of the supply position in respect of housing to be a reasonable or accurate means of drawing a conclusion on this issue.

13. It has also been indicated that an approval of development on the appeal site would be likely to prejudice the delivery of a large residential scheme at Garstang Road East. However, whilst I note the references made to the Garstang Road East site having been allocated within the Local Plan and also identified within the Preferred Options, no compelling evidence has been placed before me to support this contention, and therefore I have not attached any significant weight to this issue.
14. I am satisfied that the site would incorporate a suitable density of development in accordance with the relevant policies of the Development Plan. Whilst I have had regard to the contention of interested parties regarding the need for additional housing within Poulton-le-Fylde, on the basis of the submissions and evidence placed before me, I agree with the Council and appellants' conclusions regarding the principle of the development. I find the provision of additional housing to increase the supply in Wyre would be a significant benefit of the proposed development.

Living conditions

15. The proposed access point to serve the appeal site would comprise the land currently occupied by No. 115 Carr Head Lane, with the existing dwelling on the site to be demolished. In respect of the use of the access, the Council has highlighted concerns over the impact that the level of traffic generated by the development would have on the living conditions of occupiers of the adjoining dwellings, Nos. 113 & 117 Carr Head Lane, as well as those dwellings opposite the access at the junction with Carr Head Lane. In particular, concern has been raised in the submissions and at the Hearing with regards noise and disturbance, and light pollution as would be experienced by neighbouring occupiers.
16. In response to the expressed concerns, the appellant has reiterated that the levels of traffic generated by the proposed development would not be significant, and even during the AM peak would amount to less than one vehicle movement per minute through the proposed junction. In respect of the access itself, my attention has been drawn by the appellant to the submitted landscape proposal plan for the proposed access. This indicates that there would be sufficient available land on either side of the access to accommodate both landscaping and planting as well as a 2 metre high wall/fence along the full side elevations, which it is intended would act as acoustic barriers.
17. The appellant has commissioned a noise and vibration consultant to assess the effectiveness of the fence and wall as an acoustic barrier. In reaching their conclusion, the consultant agrees that some mitigation of the noise from the

introduction of a new residential access road between residential dwellings would usually be appropriate, particularly in respect of the use of rear gardens, and that whilst effective at ground floor level it would not provide any attenuation at first floor level for adjoining properties. Nevertheless, in this instance I observed that neither of the immediately neighbouring properties possessed directly facing first floor windows on the side elevations.

18. The submitted calculations are stated to be based upon previous noise measurements taken for individual passing cars on residential estate type roads, and indicate a noise level from the use of the access road of approximately 39 dB $L_{Aeq(16hr)}$ in the rear gardens of the neighbouring dwellings. This would include a noise reduction of at least 8 dB(A) provided by the proposed boundary treatment, and using BS8233:2014 'Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings' to provide some context, would be well below the 'desirable' external noise level of 50 dB $L_{Aeq(16hr)}$ used as a design criteria for new dwellings. The conclusion of the submitted technical evidence is therefore that the predicted traffic noise levels as experienced at neighbouring properties would be well within desirable levels.
19. The submitted noise calculations were assessed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer, and from a technical standpoint were concluded to be reasonably based in respect of the presented calculations and measurements. Despite this conclusion, the Council maintains that noise and disturbance is a subjective matter, and that the access road would introduce a noise source which was previously not there. Whilst I accept this to be the case, I am mindful of paragraph 123 of the Framework which advises that planning decisions should aim to avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development, and should mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts arising from noise.
20. In respect of paragraph 123, I am satisfied that the nature and source of the proposed noise would not be uncharacteristic of the residential area as a whole and that given the levels of traffic generation that it could not reasonably be described as presenting a significant adverse impact. Furthermore, the appellant has demonstrated that it would be possible to mitigate in part the impact of the noise on the external areas and ground floor accommodation through the use of an acoustic barrier, albeit that I accept that any landscaping and/or tree planting will provide less effective mitigation for front and rear first floor windows. Nevertheless, I note that such relationships between the side elevations of two-storey dwellings and residential estate roads are not uncommon in the context of either existing or new development, and I have not been provided with any contrary technical noise evidence that the specific relationship in this instance would be unacceptable.
21. Turning to the issue of light pollution, the Council has expressed particular concern over the impact on properties opposite the junction with Carr Head Lane of dipped beam headlights or daytime running lights on vehicles traversing the junction. I note that paragraph 125 of the Framework addresses the impact of light pollution, and how good design should be encouraged as a means of limiting the impact of artificial light on local amenity. I have also been mindful of the National Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance), and the paragraphs which address light pollution.

22. Having considered the submissions on this matter, on the basis of the content of the Framework and the Guidance, I am satisfied that where light pollution is relevant to planning it is where it focuses on light emitted from fixed sources rather than transitory sources such as moving vehicles. Furthermore, the Council has not drawn my attention to a Development Plan policy or design guidance specifically addressing the impact of light pollution from moving vehicles. Nevertheless, I accept that there may be the potential for some limited annoyance for neighbouring dwellings from the headlights of vehicles approaching the junction with Carr Head Lane at darker times of the day. However, I do not consider on the basis of my observations of the wider area that such a relationship is either unusual or uncharacteristic of established or new residential layouts, or that it is indeed unreasonable. Whilst I have noted the Council's implied reference to the need to consider each case on its own merits in light of the appellant's references to other developments, there is no compelling evidence before me on this matter which would lead me to agree with the Council's position.
23. In addition to the issues above, I note that brief reference has been made in the evidence to the impact of traffic generation on levels of fumes and air quality within the area. However, no detailed technical evidence has been provided on this matter and I note that no objections have been received from the Council's Environmental Health Officer on matters of air quality.
24. On the basis of the written and verbal submissions, I am satisfied that the proposed development would safeguard the living conditions of existing occupiers of Carr Head Lane, having regard to noise and disturbance, and light pollution. The proposals would therefore accord with saved Policy SP14 of the Local Plan, which seeks to secure high standards of design and amenity for all types of development, and ensure that traffic associated with the development should not have an adverse impact on the local environs. Furthermore, in this respect the proposal would also accord with paragraph 17 of the Framework, which seeks to ensure that development should always provide a good standard of amenity for existing occupants of land and buildings.

Highway safety and accessibility

25. The Council has indicated that, despite its concerns over the impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers from traffic generated by the proposed development, it has no objection to the impact of traffic on the local highway network, or considers the development to have an adverse impact on highway safety. The Council's conclusions have been informed by Lancashire County Council (the County Council) acting as the Highway Authority, who have also offered no objections to the proposed development on highway grounds, subject to the incorporation of mitigation to be secured through s106 contributions, off-site highway works, and planning conditions. Nevertheless, interested parties remain concerned over the accessibility of the appeal site, the impact of the proposed development on the local highway network, and on highway safety.
26. The appellant submitted a Transport Assessment (TA) in June 2014, which was based upon up to 100 dwellings served by a single point of access from Carr Head Lane, and which the appellant has indicated that despite the absence of a scoping study, was agreed in its scope by the Highway Authority. A further highway submission was prepared in March 2015 and submitted with the

appeal documentation, and provides particular responses to the reason for refusal (as addressed above) and areas of concern highlighted by interested parties. The TA provides an overall assessment of the accessibility of the site as well as the traffic impacts associated with the development, and includes traffic flow impact assessments of a series of junctions within the local area which would be likely to experience additional traffic generated by the development.

27. The appellant has also completed the County Council's Accessibility Questionnaire, which assesses the accessibility of the site against a series of criteria. In this respect, the written and verbal submissions have drawn my attention to a certain degree of dispute between the appellant, the Highway Authority and interested parties over the agreed 'scoring' of the accessibility of the appeal site in the assessment which has been undertaken. In particular, the accessibility of the appeal site to the nearest bus routes has been disputed, with the appellant having proposed mitigation improvements to bus services, including the existing subsidised No. 87 service passing close to the site access, as well as enhancements to the existing bus infrastructure in the form of raised kerbs at bus stops to facilitate disabled access.
28. The Carr Head Lane and Area Residents Association have drawn my attention to the County Council's intention to withdraw existing bus subsidies. Subsequently, it has been confirmed by the County Council that all subsidies for bus services are to be ended from April 2016, with service No. 87 running along Carr Head Lane, and service No. 75 running along Hardhorn Road expected to cease. The closest existing routes would therefore be service Nos. 12 & 13 which operate along Hardhorn Road and provide an indirect circular route from Blackpool to Poulton-le-Fylde, and service No. 42 which runs along Garstang Road East. The County Council has assessed that for a modal shift to occur that an improvement of the No. 42 service from a 60 to 30 minute frequency during peak hours, as well as maintaining the currently subsidised limited evening and weekend services would be necessary. I note that the submitted Unilateral Undertaking had anticipated the proposed subsidy to be directed towards the No. 87 service, and I have also had regard to the appellant's assertions that this service would be sustained if a legal agreement was in place to provide funding. However, even if as suggested this were not to be the case, I am satisfied that the wording of the obligation provides sufficient flexibility to allow the bus subsidy to be used for the alternative services.
29. Further to the County Council's December 2015 letter, the Residents Association has expressed concern that the County Council, in accepting that the bus stops on Hardhorn Road and Garstang Road East would be within acceptable walking distance, has contradicted its earlier submissions from October 2014. In considering this contention, the County Council has referred me to the Institution of Highways and Transportation's (IHT) "Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot", which indicates that whilst 400 metres would be the preferred maximum walking distance, journeys up to 2km are assessed as being acceptable. I have carefully considered this issue, noting that the document acts as a guideline only, and also that the existing pedestrian environment to access the bus stops is relatively flat and comprises continuous footways. On this basis, I am not persuaded that a distance of up to 550 metres to the bus stops on Garstang Road East would be unreasonable, or act as an obstacle to supporting a modal shift towards public transport. I am

therefore satisfied that the appellant has taken reasonable steps to address the identified shortfall in the accessibility of the appeal site through the provision and enhancement of public transport opportunities and facilities.

30. In respect of cycle and pedestrian access to the appeal site, I am satisfied that the distances involved to facilities and services would be within reasonable limits, and I have no reason to conclude that an appropriate layout of the development facilitating ease of access for these modes of travel could not be attained. Whilst I have noted that there were some other areas of dispute regarding the accessibility and sustainability of the appeal site, including the absence of a Travel Plan which would be secured by condition, I am satisfied that overall the site would be appropriately accessible by non-car modes of travel and note that, with the appropriate mitigation, this was a conclusion also reached by the Highway Authority.
31. Turning to an assessment of the level of highway impact, the appellant has generated trip rates from the TRICS database which indicates that a development of up to 100 dwellings could be expected to generate 56 vehicular trips in the AM peak (16 arrival & 40 departure), and 50 trips in the PM peak (33 arrival & 17 departure). Furthermore, in assessing the impact on specific parts of the local highway network, the appellant has utilised the Census '*Journey to Work*' data to predict the distribution of trips within the locality. From this data, and predicted levels of background traffic growth to 2020, the appellant has drawn the conclusion that there would be the potential for some increases in observed queue lengths in the morning, with reference made to Hardhorn Road in particular. However, the TA concludes that any such residual traffic impact from the development, taking into account the proposed mitigation of the introduction of MOVA signal traffic controls at the Hardhorn Road – Garstang Road East junction, would not be singularly or cumulatively severe. I note that, this conclusion was also concurred with by the technical response of the highway authority in assessing the planning application.
32. Various objections have been received from interested parties on highway matters, including detailed submissions from the Carr Head Lane and Area Residents Association, who had commissioned a review of the submitted TA as well as submitting written and verbal evidence on highway matters during the course of the appeal and at the Hearing. I have carefully considered the issues raised.
33. The impact of the development on existing traffic conditions on Hardhorn Road is a matter of some concern for interested parties and the Residents Association, and in particular the adequacy and suitability of the proposed mitigation agreed with the Highway Authority. In this respect, I have had regard to the issue of the timing of the traffic surveys along Hardhorn Road and whether the reliability of these may have been effected by roadworks being undertaken in the area. However, there does not seem to be any particular dispute between the parties that there are existing traffic queues along Hardhorn Road, which even allowing for the presence of roadworks at the time of my site visit, I observed stretched in length back to the junction with Beech Road.
34. With regards to the use of the "MOVA" (Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation) signal control system, the appellant has submitted Department for Transport Traffic Advisory Leaflet 3/97, which states that the system is suited

to use on heavily loaded or congested junctions, where on average reductions in delays of an average of 13% may be experienced. I have noted the view expressed by the Residents Association over the impact of 'downstream' conditions from the town centre causing exit blocking on the A586 Garstang Road East, but also that highway works elsewhere have gone some way to alleviating such conditions. As a consequence of the evidence placed before me, I see no conclusive reason why the proposed MOVA system would not provide a reasonable prospect of a reduction in delays and the length of queues, which would provide at least an appropriate and suitable level of mitigation for the traffic impacts on Hardhorn Road of the development. Whilst I have noted the submissions made over the desirability of securing significant enhancements to existing traffic conditions in the area, the developer's remit and responsibility in the context of the development of the appeal site would be limited to the mitigation of the impacts arising from the development.

35. Interested parties have also raised concern over the absence of any assessment of traffic flows on Carr Head Lane, and the suitability of the junction with Garstang Road East for accommodating large flows of traffic. In this respect, the Residents Association has undertaken its own traffic survey, a summary of which indicates that a significant degree of 'rat-running' along Beech Drive and Carr Head Lane to avoid traffic queues on Hardhorn Road, already takes place. In the absence of any contrary survey results, I have no reason to dispute the figures provided by the Residents Association, and furthermore observed the proximity of the junction between Carr Head Lane and Garstang Road East to a signal controlled junction on Garstang Road East.
36. Nevertheless, on the basis of the evidence submitted on trip generation and distribution and my own observations of the Carr Head Lane – Garstang Road East junction, I agree with the Council that the effect of the proposed mitigation at the existing Hardhorn Road – Garstang Road East junction would be likely to make some redress to the balance between the delays experienced on Hardhorn Road, and the desirability of using Carr Head Lane and the junction with Garstang Road East. In any event, I note that the Highway Authority has not concluded that the levels of traffic using Carr Head Lane, even during peak times, would be in excess of the capacity of the network at this point, and has not objected to the impact of the development on the performance of the junction with Garstang Road East.
37. Concern has also been raised regarding the coverage of the TA in respect of the absence of recorded injury accidents within 300 metres of the proposed site access, as well as the failure to report an assessment of road safety in the wider area. I have noted the Council's conclusions that these amounted to either errors or omissions from the TA, but have also noted that the issues were assessed by the Highway Authority, including the evidence of injury accidents on Carr Head Lane, in the formulation of their technical response to the Council.
38. In this respect, I have taken into account the conclusions which were reached by the Council that whilst there was evidence of injury accidents within the area, the causes of the accidents and the overall rates were not so significant as to draw the conclusion that highway conditions in the wider area could be described as unacceptable or hazardous. Despite this, the Highway Authority has highlighted the potential for shunt type collisions within longer traffic queues which I accept in the case of observed traffic queues on Hardhorn

Road, would be an existing peak hour situation. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that the level of reported accidents of this type would not be in excess of what would normally be expected along roads of similar characteristic and usage, and given the indicated mitigation measures, there is no compelling evidence that the proposed development would unacceptably worsen this situation.

39. I have had regard to the concerns which have been raised as to the suitability of Carr Head Lane as the access point for the proposed development, as well as the potential for any adverse impact on pedestrian usage of Oldfield Carr Lane. Whilst I have noted the absence of speed surveys for Carr Head Lane, on the basis of my observations of vehicle speeds on the site visit I am satisfied that the visibility splays which would be available at the access point to the development would be acceptable, with my attention drawn to them being in excess of that required for a speed limit of 30 mph, as defined in *Manual for Streets*. Furthermore, I am not persuaded that the frequency or quantum of parked vehicles along Carr Head Lane would have such an adverse impact as to render the proposed access as hazardous for vehicular use.
40. With regards the existing pedestrian environment on Oldfield Carr Lane, I observed this to be limited to the south of the site as a consequence of an absence of pavement along sections of the carriageway. However, being mindful of the technical evidence on the distribution of trips from the appeal site, I consider that any increase in either vehicular or pedestrian use of Oldfield Carr Lane resulting from the development would be limited, and any residual impact from the development would not therefore be severe. I have also considered the relationship between the proposed development and the primary school on Carr Head Lane. However, whilst I have had regard to the concerns which have been expressed over the safety of children at the beginning and end of the school day, for the reasons already given, I do not consider that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on Carr Head Lane in respect of traffic generation, and as a consequence, on pedestrian safety.
41. In reaching my conclusion, I have been mindful of the absence of any technical objection to the proposed development from the County Council acting as the Highway Authority, or an associated reason for refusal on the planning application. In reaching my conclusions on any residual highway impacts, I have also been mindful of Section 4 of the Framework which promotes sustainable transport, and at paragraph 32 sets out that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
42. In this instance, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have a singular or cumulative severe impact on the safety of highway users, drivers and pedestrians. Whilst my attention has not been drawn to a relevant development plan policy, I am satisfied that the proposals would accord with Policy CS16 of the Preferred Options, which sets out that new development will be in locations that can be made to have as good a choice of travel options as possible, and mitigates effects on the local transport network arising from the development. Furthermore, the proposal would accord with paragraph 32 of the Framework, as it would not result in severe residual cumulative impacts on transport grounds.

Infrastructure requirements

43. Following the hearing, a completed Section 106 Unilateral Undertaking (the Undertaking) has been submitted which, in connection with the implementation of the scheme, provides for a suite of mitigation measures addressing local infrastructure, services and amenities, and is dated 30 June 2015. Financial contributions are to be made towards education, public transport and bus subsidy, and the preparation of a travel plan for the appeal site. Furthermore, the Undertaking is to secure the provision and approval of a landscaping and management scheme, as well as a phasing strategy, which would be managed by the owners or through a residents' management company. Whilst the legal agreement itself appears to be in general order, I will consider the obligations in light of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.
44. Policy CS17 of the Preferred Options sets out the need for provision of, or contribution towards community, physical and social infrastructure (including education facilities) where new development results in an increased demand for such infrastructure which cannot be met by the existing. In terms of education provision, the policy is consistent with paragraph 72 of the Framework which states that the government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities.
45. On the basis of its pupil projections and education requirement, the County Council assessed during the course of the planning application that the proposed development would result in demand for 38 primary places, and 15 secondary places. It concluded that the material increase in the demand for primary school places for the period 2014-2019 could not be fully met by existing provision, which equated to a contribution towards 20 primary school places. However, no requirement was identified at the same time for contributions towards additional secondary school places, given the projected capacity of 155 places at the time of assessment. This conclusion was caveated on the basis of the potential for revision, were certain other residential developments to be subsequently granted planning permission. The Council's Committee Report from December 2014 indicates an acceptance by the appellant of both the quantum of the required obligations and the methodology for calculating the contribution in accordance with the Lancashire County Council Planning Obligations SPD.
46. During the course of the planning appeal, the County Council advanced in an updated education assessment a revised position regarding contributions towards education places. This indicated that as a result of the subsequent granting of consent for various additional residential schemes, as well as increased pupil projections forecast for the period 2015-2020, there would be a shortfall of 110 primary places and 60 secondary places. As a consequence, the development would need to mitigate in full its impact through the provision of contributions towards 38 primary school places, as well as 15 secondary school places.
47. The County Council has advised that the basis for the calculation of the updated pupil projection forecasts is in accordance with that set out in the *Planning Obligations in Lancashire Methodology 2014*. The methodology indicates that where new housing development creates a demand for school

places in excess of those available, or which are projected to become over-subscribed within 5 years, a financial contribution will be sought from developers, which is proportionate to impact in order to mitigate against the effect of any new development on local infrastructure. The projections take into account current numbers on roll, live births, inward/outward migration to and from schools based upon recent patterns of attendance, and planned housing contained within the district 5 year Housing Land Supply documentation. On the basis of the evidence before me, I find this to be a reasonable premise and methodology upon which to calculate the forecasts.

48. In this instance, I accept the appellant's point that the uplift in pupil projection forecasts from 2019 to 2020 appears to be a relatively large increase, although I am not persuaded on the basis of the evidence before me that the Council has departed from the adopted methodology which it has previously used as a means of assessing the level of contributions required by development. Nevertheless, the appellant has contended that the uplift in pupil projection forecasts has been unreasonably influenced by schemes which have already been accounted for or have mitigated their impact through contributions. In this respect, I have noted the response of the County Council which has stated that the use of housing land supply details in the forecasts is limited to dwellings which have planning permission, are deliverable within 5 years, and do not have a sealed Section 106 legal agreement in place which has mitigated the impact of their development.
49. On this matter, I have had careful regard to recently consented schemes, as well as the County Council's concession regarding some of the points raised by the appellant regarding primary school capacity. I have also been mindful of the appellant's requests for full details of the basis for the uplift in pupil projection forecasts for the period to 2020, and that despite other Council's being prepared to release such data, that these have not been satisfied. However, in this latter respect I note the decision regarding the release of such information has been concluded to be prejudicial in response to a Freedom of Information (FOI) request. I must therefore base my conclusions upon the evidence placed before me, although I have had particular regard to the absence of any dispute by the appellant over the methodology used by the County Council when agreeing the principle of contributions during either the course of the planning application or the appeal prior to the publication of the County Council's updated assessment. I am not therefore persuaded on the basis of the appellant's submissions that the methodology which has been used up until now should be set aside.
50. Turning to the specific levels of obligation, in respect of the contribution towards primary school places I consider that even allowing for the absence of the full details for the background of the pupil projection forecasts, it is reasonable for the County Council to request a full contribution towards mitigation of the development's impact. I accept that some recently consented schemes have been required to mitigate their impact in the form of contributions towards school places. However, given the previously highlighted limited available capacity and even allowing for the inclusion of a bulge year, I am satisfied on the balance of probability that any residual capacity of primary school places accepted by the parties as being available at the time of negotiations on this scheme, would now have been used up by the quantum of residential development consented in the intervening period.

51. With regards to secondary school places, I find the position to be less conclusive on the basis of the information provided within the County Council's Education Contribution Assessments, and the appellant's own assessment of there being no requirement for places. I have been mindful of the conclusion in the County Council's October 2014 Education Assessment that there would be 155 secondary school places available in 2019, but also that this figure would be dependent upon additional housing developments listed within the document, as well as the up-to-date pupil projections for 2020. Whilst I have noted the appellant's contention regarding their calculation of remaining spare capacity further to an assessment of the demand for additional secondary school places from the listed developments, I note that these calculations do not take into account the pupil projections for the period to 2020 but continue to draw conclusions based upon 2019. I find this to be a significant flaw in the robustness of the appellant's calculations as it presents an inconsistent picture against the up-to-date projections provided by the County Council. I cannot therefore accept the appellant's construction of the level of contribution in this respect and conclude that the County Council's calculation would be the minimum required to address the impact.
52. I have had regard to the drafting of the unilateral undertaking which has provided 'alternatives' in respect of the level of contribution towards primary and secondary education. However, on the basis of the evidence placed before me, I find that calculation (A)(iii) based upon up to a maximum of 38 additional places would be required in respect of primary education contributions, whilst calculation (A)(ii) based upon up to a maximum of 15 additional places would be required in respect of secondary education contributions. On this basis, I am satisfied that the provision of funding for education contributions would be directly related to the development, necessary to its acceptability in planning terms, and fairly and reasonably related in scale. I am also satisfied on the strength of the evidence that the County Council has not reached the maximum pooled limit of 5 generic education contributions allowed by virtue of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.
53. Turning to the other obligations, the provision of a public transport contribution towards improvements to nearby bus stops on Hardhorn Road, and a bus subsidy to be used to enhance local services, would address highlighted deficiencies in infrastructure provision close to the appeal site. These measures would be directly related to the site, and necessary as a means of encouraging sustainable travel in accordance with paragraph 32 of the Framework, and would be fairly and reasonably related in scale. I am also satisfied that the payment of a contribution to the County Council Travel Plan team to support the development and implementation of the travel plan would accord with the Regulation 122 provisions. The provision of open space within the development is necessary to its acceptability under saved Policy H13 of the Local Plan, and the obligation in respect of the submission of a landscaping and management scheme, and a phasing strategy, coupled with the setting up of a resident's management company whose primary object is to maintain the public open space recognises the importance of this space in perpetuity.
54. I have carefully considered the Council's submissions on behalf of the County Council with regards to the inclusion of additional definitions within the Undertaking, and disagreement with some of those which have been inserted by the appellant. However, there is no suggestion that either the absence of these definitions or inclusion of existing definitions makes the Undertaking

unenforceable, and I am satisfied therefore that the intent and objective of the Undertaking can still be achieved.

55. I am satisfied, having reviewed the submitted evidence, that sufficient justification for both the principle and the specific sums which have been required has been provided. I consider that the measures in the undertaking are necessary, related directly to the development and fairly related in scale and kind. As such they would accord with the provisions of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy regulations 2010 and the tests for planning obligations set out in the Framework.

Other Matters

56. The appellant has indicated that the proposed development would provide a level of affordable housing in accordance with the Council's housing viability study, which comprises the evidence base for the Core Strategy Preferred Options. The provision of 30% affordable housing is considered by the Council to be both deliverable and viable and would address the locally identified affordable housing need, in accordance with paragraph 50 of the Framework. Given that the full detail of the affordable housing provision would be established at the reserved matters stage, the Council has indicated that it would be satisfied in this instance that the imposition of a suitably worded condition would adequately secure the provision, and I would agree with this approach.
57. A number of other issues have been raised by interested parties, including the impact on biodiversity, flooding and drainage issues, whether there would be an adverse impact on the living conditions of existing occupiers in respect of privacy and overlooking, as well as the setting of precedent for future similar development and the impact on property values. I note that some of these are matters which have been addressed by the Council within its committee report, although I am also satisfied that technical matters related to flooding and drainage have been properly considered, with appropriate mitigation in the form of a surface water drainage scheme secured.
58. In respect of issues related to biodiversity, and in particular the potential for any impact of the development on wildlife including European Protected Species, namely Great Crested Newts, I am satisfied that a thorough assessment has been made in the context of the development proposals. In this respect, I note that Regulation 9(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) Regulations 2012 (the Habitat Regulations) places a duty on the competent authority to have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive in exercise of their functions.
59. Natural England has expressly required the Council to undertake an assessment as to whether there is a reasonable prospect of a licence being granted, subject to three tests. I have had regard to the Council's conclusions that by making a contribution to additional market and affordable housing the proposed development would be in the public interest, and that the potential alternative for the site would be cultivation, to the detriment of the habitat of the Great Crested Newt. Finally, the Council, in conjunction with the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) has concluded the development could be permitted without being detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of Great Crested Newts concerned. On the basis of the evidence before me, I have no reason to dispute these conclusions, and note that the potential harm

to Great Crested Newts is reported to be a relatively small loss of sub-optimal terrestrial habitat, and a low risk of direct harm during construction, with mitigation in the form of alternative habitat shown on the indicative masterplan as being incorporated within the development. Taking into account that further mitigation surveys for Great Crested Newts and Badgers are proposed, as well as restrictions over the timing of vegetation clearance to protect nesting birds, and the submission of a Landscape and Habitat Creation and Management Scheme secured by condition, I am satisfied the biodiversity impacts of the appeal site have been fully investigated and addressed, and that there is a reasonable likelihood of a licence being granted in accordance with the Habitat Regulations.

60. Turning to concerns over the potential for the development to result in a loss of privacy or overlooking for existing occupiers of Carr Head Lane, I observed at the site visit the relationship between the rear gardens and the appeal site. In this respect, the layout of development is an issue which will be considered in detail at the reserved matters stage. However, I am satisfied that whilst the existing outlook from the rear of the Carr Head Lane properties will undoubtedly alter, there is no reason why the proposed development could not be designed in such a manner as to secure the living conditions of existing occupiers.
61. It is argued that allowing this appeal would set an undesirable precedent for similar developments. However, whilst no comparable sites where this might apply have been suggested, a scheme genuinely comparable with this one would be likely to be acceptable and I envisage that the Council would be successfully able to resist any development which could be shown to be likely to cause demonstrable harm.
62. I have considered all other matters raised, including the suggestion that the scheme would affect local property prices, although I am not persuaded that any of these matters justify the refusal of permission for the scheme.

Conditions

63. Turning to the suggested conditions, I have considered these in the light of paragraph 206 of the Framework. This paragraph sets out that planning conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects.
64. Condition nos. 1 – 4 relating to the reserved matters, timeliness, the identification of plans, and the phasing of development are necessary in the interest of proper planning, the avoidance of doubt, and the delivery of the proposed development. Condition no. 5 would be in the interest of providing, through the reserved matters, a safe and secure development. Condition no. 6 would secure the provision of an appropriate proportion of affordable housing on site in accordance with locally identified need and national policy.
65. Condition nos. 7 – 9 and 16 would be necessary to ensure compliance with the mitigation set out in the Flood Risk Assessment, to provide for a scheme of surface water drainage and disposal of foul waters, and an assessment of the potential for on-site land contamination. Condition nos. 10 – 15 would be necessary in the interests of biodiversity. These conditions would secure the protection of birds and protected species through additional surveys for

Badgers and Great Crested Newts, the provision of a Landscape and Habitat Creation and Management Scheme, the protection and retention of trees and hedgerows, and a scheme of site lighting to avoid light pollution. Also in the case of Condition no. 13 related to the retention and protection of trees, this would be in the interests of the character and appearance of the new development and the area.

66. Condition no. 17 securing a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) would be necessary in the interest of securing the amenity of the wider area, with condition nos. 18 and 19 related to the construction of the access required in the interests of the provision of a satisfactory highway environment. Condition no. 20 requiring the submission of a Travel Plan would be necessary in the interests of delivering sustainable transport measures, whilst condition no. 22 regarding a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be necessary in the interests of highway safety. Providing for a landscape management plan prior to each phase of the development would secure the strategic landscaping of the appeal site.
67. The Council had also suggested a condition related to the dwellings approved achieving a minimum level three sustainability rating under the Code for Sustainable Homes. However, this means of measuring the sustainability rating of development has now been withdrawn as a result of the introduction of a new suite of national technical standards. Nevertheless, I note that Building Regulations Part L 2013 is already equivalent to the former Code level 3 on energy. I have therefore omitted this condition.

Conclusion

68. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions listed.

M Seaton

INSPECTOR

Annex

Conditions

- 1) No development for which outline planning permission has hereby been granted shall be started on any phase within the development until full details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") in respect of that phase within the development, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 2) Application for approval of reserved matters for each phase shall be made not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission and the development must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters, or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: - Dwg. No. 14-056 LP01 - Site Location Plan, Dwg. No. SCP/12247/F04 Rev A - Site Access Arrangements
- 4) No development hereby approved shall commence until a phasing scheme for the development which sets out the sequence in which the various elements of the development will be constructed and brought into use has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved phasing scheme.
- 5) Any application for the approval of reserved matters for any phase within the development hereby approved shall be accompanied by a 'Crime Prevention Plan' [CPP] for that phase which shall examine all aspects of site security including, site car parking, pedestrian footways, entrances, internal layout and external security measures for that plot and which shall be capable of meeting 'Secured by Design' requirements. Development of that phase shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CPP and any approved site security measures shall be retained thereafter.
- 6) The development shall not begin until a scheme for the provision and retention of affordable housing as part of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The affordable housing shall be provided and thereafter retained in accordance with the approved scheme and shall meet the definition of affordable housing in Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework or any future guidance that replaces it. The scheme shall include:
 - i. the numbers, type, tenure and location on the site of the affordable housing provision to be made which shall consist of not less than 30% of housing units;
 - ii. the timing of the construction of the affordable housing and its phasing in relation to the occupancy of the market housing;

- iii. the arrangements for the transfer of the affordable housing to an affordable housing provider [or the management of the affordable housing];
 - iv. the arrangements to ensure that such provision is affordable for both first and subsequent occupiers of the affordable housing;
 - v. the occupancy criteria to be used for determining the identity of occupiers of the affordable housing and the means by which such occupancy criteria shall be enforced.
- 7) The development, or phase of development hereby approved shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (Ref: 45534P1R0, dated March 2014) and the mitigation measures detailed within the FRA. The mitigation measures for that phase of development shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.
- 8) Prior to the commencement of development, or phase of development, hereby approved a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage strategy should demonstrate the surface water run-off generated up to and including the 1 in 100 year critical storm will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site following the corresponding rainfall event. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details and phasing before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include details of how the scheme will be maintained and managed and by whom after completion.
- 9) Prior to the commencement of development, or phase of development, a scheme for the disposal of foul waters within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 10) Vegetation shall only be removed / cleared outside of the optimum period for bird nesting (March to July inclusive) unless a report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority demonstrating that any nesting / breeding birds have been shown to be absent.
- 11) If development hereby approved by this permission has not commenced within 1 year of the date of the ecological assessment then a repeat walk over survey of the site shall be undertaken to assess if badgers are present on the site. Should badgers be present a detailed method statement outlining the approach to be taken to on site badger exclusion and sett closure shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority and shall be carried out in accordance with the approved statement.
- 12) Prior to the commencement of development, or phase of development, hereby approved a Landscape and Habitat Creation and Management Scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority. The approved Scheme shall identify the opportunities for biodiversity enhancement on site including (but not limited to)

- Species rich hedgerow planting
- Bolstering of hedgerows
- Creation of ponds
- Bat bricks and/or tubes within the new development
- Bat boxes
- Bird boxes
- Native tree and shrub planting

The approved scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the phasing details as provided by condition 4.

- 13) No development, or any phase of development, hereby approved shall commence on site until a scheme which provides for the retention and protection of trees, shrubs and hedges within (or overhanging) the site or phase, which may be affected by the construction process, with the exception of those trees clearly shown to be felled on the submitted plan, and any other trees the removal of which is approved through the approval of reserved matters applications, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed tree protection measures shall remain until all development is completed within that phase and no work, including any form of drainage or storage of materials, earth or topsoil shall take place within the perimeter of such protective fencing.
- 14) Prior to the commencement of development, or phase of development, hereby approved, a scheme of site lighting to demonstrate avoidance of light pollution / artificial illumination during the construction and operational phases of development upon retained trees and hedgerows shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full and maintained and retained thereafter.
- 15) No development, including any vegetation clearance or ground works, shall take place within the application site until a Comprehensive Great Crested Newt Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Method Statement.
- 16) No development shall be commenced until a desk study has been undertaken and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority to investigate and produce an assessment of the risk of the potential for on-site contamination. If the desk study identifies potential contamination, a detailed site investigation shall be carried out in accordance with a written methodology, which shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. If remediation measures are then considered necessary, a scheme for decontamination of the site shall be submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority in writing and the scheme implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to the development of the site. Any changes to

the agreed scheme must be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works being undertaken.

- 17) Prior to the commencement of the development, or phase of development hereby approved, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to include details of the measures proposed during construction to manage and mitigate the main environmental effects. The following matters shall be addressed:
- (i) the times of construction activities on site
 - (ii) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - (iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
 - (iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
 - (v) wheel washing facilities
 - (vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
 - (vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
 - (viii) measures to prevent disturbance to adjacent dwellings from noise and vibration, including any piling activity
 - (ix) measures to prevent the pollution of watercourses

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP.

- 18) The approved access shall be constructed in accordance with the Lancashire County Council Specification for Construction of Estate Roads to at least base course level before any other development takes place within the site.
- 19) No part of the development hereby approved shall commence until a scheme for the construction of the site access and the off-site works of highway improvement has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the approved scheme has been constructed and completed in accordance with the scheme details.
- 20) Prior to commencement of development, or phase of development, hereby approved a Framework Travel Plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The provisions of the Framework Travel Plan shall be implemented and operated in accordance with the timetable contained therein unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The Framework Travel Plan must include a schedule for the submission of a Full Travel Plan within a suitable timeframe of first occupation, the development being brought into use or other identifiable stage of development. Where the Local

Planning Authority agrees a timetable for implementation of a Framework or Full Travel Plan, the elements are to be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. All elements shall continue to be implemented at all times thereafter for as long as any part of the development is occupied or used/for a minimum of at least 5 years.

- 21) Prior to the commencement of each phase of the development a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, other than small, privately owned, domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The landscape management plan shall be implemented as approved.
- 22) No part of the development shall be commenced until a Construction Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the aforementioned plan.

Richborough Estates

APPEARANCES*

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Robin Buckley	Redrow Homes Ltd. (Appellant)
Roger Lancaster	Barrister, Kings Chambers
Tony McAteer	McAteer Associates Ltd.
David Robertson	SCP Transport

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Cllr. Terry Lees	Councillor, Wyre Council
Cllr. Ron Greenhaugh	Councillor, Wyre Council
Lindsey Hayes	Senior Planner, Wyre Council (Advisory Capacity Only)

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Stephen Davies	Local Resident & Chair of Carr Head Lane and Area Resident's Association
Cllr. Alf Clempson	County Councillor, Lancashire County Council
Cllr. Simon Bridge	Councillor, Wyre Council
Craig Miller	Local Resident
Lynda Brinklow	Local Resident
John Gyte	Local Resident
Ian Gregson	Local Resident

*This is not a comprehensive list of people who spoke - other people who were present also made brief comments at points during the Hearing and Site Visit.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

- 1 Plan Extract of Potential Development Sites – Poulton-le-Fylde
- 2 Secretary of State Appeal Decisions (APP/R0660/A/13/2197532 & APP/R0660/A/13/2197529) dated 17 March 2015 – Land off Audlem Road/Broad Lane, Stapeley, Nantwich & Land off Destapeleigh Way, Nantwich
- 3 Secretary of State Appeal Decision (APP/C2741/V/14/2216946) dated 18 March 2015 – Brecks Lane, Strensall, York
- 4 Technical Note: Correction to Accessibility Score, prepared by SCP
- 5 Technical Note: Correction to Bus Information, prepared by SCP
- 6 Department for Transport Traffic Advisory Leaflet 3/97 – The “MOVA” Signal Control System
- 7 Hepworth Acoustics submission dated 19 May 2015, regarding acoustic barrier proposed for the access road.
- 8 Drawing No. 4769.02 – Landscape Proposal – Access.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE HEARING

- 1 Draft undated and unsigned s106 Unilateral Undertaking, received 23 June 2015.
- 2 Covering Letter from McAteer Associates dated 23 June 2015, and Education Contributions Rebuttal Statement (incl. Appendices) dated 5 June 2015, prepared by EPDS Consultants on behalf of Appellant.
- 3 Letter from Wyre Council (with appendices) dated 23 June 2015.
- 4 Submission from Carr Head Lane and Area Residents Association, received 23 June 2015.
- 5 Covering Letter from Redrow Homes Ltd dated 30 June 2015, and completed s106 Unilateral Undertaking dated 30 June 2015
- 6 Letter from McAteer Associates dated 2 July 2015
- 7 Letter from EPDS Consultants dated 2 July 2015
- 8 Letter from Lancashire County Council dated 2 July 2015
- 9 Submission from Carr Head Lane and Area Residents Association, received 6 July 2015
- 10 Letter from Wyre Council dated 19 August 2015
- 11 Letter from Redrow Homes Ltd. Dated 27 August 2015
- 12 Submission from Carr Head Lane and Area Residents Association, received 24 November 2015
- 13 Letter from McAteer Associates dated 8 December 2015
- 14 Submission from Carr Head Lane and Area Residents Association, received 8 December 2015
- 15 Submission from Carr Head Lane and Area Residents Association, received 9 December 2015
- 16 Letter from Lancashire County Council dated 10 December 2015
- 17 Letter from Redrow Homes Ltd dated 8 January 2016.